

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8, 10, and 12-17 are currently pending.

**Telephonic Interview**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the phone interview of August 25, 2005, and now make the substance of the interview of record per 37 C.F.R. 1.133(b).

In the interview, the Examiner agreed that at least one element of independent claims 1 and 8 was not disclosed in the applied reference. Specifically, the Examiner agreed that U.S. Patent No. 6,425,084 to Rallis et al. (hereinafter "Rallis") does not disclose "a physical shield, substantially opaque to the wavelength of the signal, for substantially confining reception of the signal to the token sensor," as included in Claim 1; or "physically shielding the signal in a substantially opaque manner with respect to the wavelength of the signal to confine reception of the signal to the sensor," as included in Claim 8. Applicants thank the Examiner for reconsidering this element.

In addition, Applicants' representatives and the Examiner discussed whether Rallis also disclosed "a token interface emitter, for producing a signal having information including the personal identifier, ...the signal produced by the token interface emitter being sent to and received by the token." No agreement was reached.

**35 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Action on pages 2-3, section 3, claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Rallis. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. In addition to not teaching the physical shield element of claim 1 as discussed above, Rallis fails to teach at least one other element of claim 1.

Specifically, Rallis fails to teach "a token interface emitter, for producing **a signal having information including the personal identifier**, ...the signal produced by the token interface emitter **being sent to and received by the token**." Instead, the passage of Rallis cited in the Action (col. 5, ll. 51-57) discloses that the IR key transmits a message, which includes the key device serial number and the encryption key, to the user-validation program. The PIN in Rallis is separate from the key device serial number and encryption key, and is not transmitted to the user-validation

program at this time, nor is it transmitted to the key. As shown in Rallis, the PIN entry is received and used only by the user-validation program, not the key. See FIG. 3A, col. 4, ll. 10-26. Further, the key device serial number and encryption key in Rallis are **not** personal identifier(s) entered by the user.

In contrast, in claim 1, the personal identifier, which is entered by the user into an input device, is then transmitted to the token. See, e.g., FIG. 10 in the present specification.

Therefore, because Rallis fails to teach at least two elements of claim 1, claim 1 is allowable and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and is allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

In the Action on page 3, sections 4-7, claims 2, 3, 5, and 6, respectively are rejected as being anticipated by Rallis. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 depend from claim 1 and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

In the Action on pages 3-4, section 8, claim 8 is rejected as being anticipated by Rallis. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claim 8 recites similar elements as those in claim 1, and is allowable for at least the same reasons as those given for claim 1.

In the Action on pages 4-5, sections 9-13, and 15, claims 10, 12-15, and 17 are rejected as being anticipated by Rallis. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claims 10, 12-15, and 17 are dependent from claim 8, and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

In the Action on page 5, section 14, claims 7 and 16 are rejected as being anticipated by Rallis. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claim 7 depends from claim 1, and claim 16 depends from claim 8, and each is allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated:

Sept. 1, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Ed  
Edward W. Yee  
Registration No.: 47,294  
VENABLE LLP  
P.O. Box 34385  
Washington, DC 20043-9998  
(202) 344-4000  
(202) 344-8300 (Fax)  
Attorney For Applicant